UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/693,333	10/24/2003	Jeremiah Seth Epling	MS1-1755US	8246

22801   7590   05/12/2010
LEE & HAYES, PLLC
601 W. RIVERSIDE AVENUE
SUITE 1400
SPOKANE, WA 99201

EXAMINER
CHUMPITAZ, BOB R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3629	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
05/12/2010	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

lhptoms@leehayes.com

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS,
WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _05 February 2010_.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-13 and 15-20_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _14 and 21_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1-13 and 15-20_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

        1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

        2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

        3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

The following is a Final Office Action is in response to communication received on

February 5, 2010. Claims 1-3, 11, 16, 18 have been amended and claims 14 and 21 have been

cancelled. Claims 1-13 and 15-20 are pending and addressed below.

Claim Objections

Claim 1 is objected to because of the following informalities:

Claim 1, has been amended to recite: "combining," however, the previous claim language

reciting: "outputting" has been omitted. Applicant(s) is reminded amendments to a claim

must be made by rewriting the entire claim with all changes (e.g. additions and

deletions). The text of any deleted subject matter must be shown by being placed within

double brackets if strike-through cannot be easily perceived. Appropriate correction is

required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the **first paragraph** of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making
and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it
pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode
contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with

the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which

was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one

skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Claim 1 has been amended to include: "***storing** the identified specific portions* of the Web site privacy policy ***to a conflict bucket** of the client computer*, the conflict bucket limited to the specific portions of the Web site privacy policy that conflict with the user concerns" and "***combining** the identified specific portions* from the conflict bucket with non-conflicting portions of the Web site privacy policy ***to a user interface, the user interface including a single instance of each element of the Web site privacy policy.**"
The newly amended claim limitations fail the written description requirement. First, the process for "***storing** the identified specific portions......to a conflict bucket of the client computer*" is not fully supported in the specification. The specification, Pg. 13, lines 12-14, recites: "if a match is found ("yes" branch, block 304), then that particular statement is identified as being a conflicting statement at block 306." There is not clear recitation indicating the process wherein the particular statement identified is actually being stored to a conflict bucket of the client computer. Furthermore, there is also no support stating the "conflict bucket" is part of the client computer (see Pg. 13, lines 14-16 and Pg. 14, lines 1-5). Second, the process for "***combining** the identified specific portions...*" is not fully supported in the specification. As noted above, in the objection to claim 1, the newly amended claim limitation, omitted the previous claim language "outputting" which is fully supported. Appropriate corrections are required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matte r pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-6, 8-13 and 15-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over P3P Book: "Introduction to P3P" (www.p3pbook.com/ch01.pdf)

(hereinafter P3P) in view of Silicon Press: "Platform for privacy preferences (P3P)

technology brief" (2002) and in further view of Koike (US 2003/0084300 A1).

As per claim 1, P3P discloses a processor-executable method for outputting a transformed Web

site privacy policy onto a display device, comprising:

> receiving one or more user concerns, the one or more user concerns generated
>
> from a user concerns interface displayed on a client computer, the user concerns
>
> interface having a list of selectable user concerns (Pg. 4: P3P tools allow users to
>
> configure their web browsers with their personal privacy preferences); comparing, via a
>
> processor, the one or more user concerns with a Web site privacy policy (Pgs. 3, 7-8:
>
> tools to compare each policy against the user's privacy preferences and assist the user in
>
> deciding when to exchange data with websites).
>
>
> With respect to: "identifying specific portions of the Web site privacy policy that conflict
>
> with the user concerns; storing the identified specific portions of the Web site privacy

policy to a conflict bucket <u>of the client computer, the conflict bucket limited to the specific portions of the Web site privacy policy that conflict with the user concerns; combining</u> the identified specific portions from the conflict bucket <u>with</u> non-conflicting portions of the Web site privacy policy <u>to a user interface, the user interface including a single instance of each element of the Web site privacy policy; displaying the user interface onto the display device, the identified specific portions appearing before the non-conflicting portions of the user interface,</u>" P3P discloses an example of the kind of information displayed by one P3P user agent, the AT&T Privacy Bird beta 1.1, where the AT&T Privacy Bird displays specific icons at sites with P3P policies that match and that do not match a user's privacy preferences. Users can click on the specific icon to view a summary of the site's privacy policy that is generated automatically from the site's P3P policy. At sites that do not match a user's preference, the policy summary also explains where the policy differs from the user's preferences (Pgs. 7-8). Additionally, the Silicon Press teaches pertinent subject matter indicating a process where web browsers match privacy policies against user preferences and alert the user in case of conflicts (Pgs. 2-3). Silicon Press also teaches wherein users control the data about them that websites can collect and what they can do with it (Pg. 4). Furthermore, Koike also teaches pertinent subject matter directed to a method and system for administrating data including privacy of a user in communication made between a server and a terminal device. Koike teaches wherein a controller outputs data indicative of inconsistency between the privacy preference and the privacy policy [0039-42]. Koike further teaches wherein if a privacy policy is judged to be unacceptable to a user, a comparator outputs not only the results of

comparison, but also data indicative of inconsistency between the privacy policy and the

privacy preference ([0121-122]; see also Claim 19 and its associated text). The Examiner

in at least the teachings of Koike interprets the process for storing, combining and

displaying the identified specific conflicting and non-conflicting portions associated with

website privacy policy and user concerns to be taught in the teachings of Koike. Koike

clearly teaches the key structural elements along with the processes required for

conduction a concrete presentation of a privacy policy that has undergone specific data

comparison analysis in order to verify a website's privacy policy is in line with a user's

privacy policy by displaying the results of the data comparison via a display unit.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to modify the computer readable format for privacy policies and protocol that

enables web browsers to read and process privacy policies automatically of P3P to

include the process of identifying conflicts between a website's privacy policy and user

preferences as taught by Silicon Press and to include the process of outputting conflicting

and non-conflicting web site privacy policy data comparison results as taught by Koike in

order to effectively present website viewers with a detailed result outlining all of the data

indicative to the data comparison process.

As per claims 2 and 3, the P3P/Silicon Press/Koike combination disclose claim 1 as rejected

above, where P3P further discloses "<u>wherein the identifying specific portions of the Web site</u>

<u>privacy policy that conflict with the user concerns further comprises displaying an icon to the</u>

<u>display device</u>; wherein the <u>displaying the user interface onto the display device receives a</u>

selection of the icon to display the user interface,"(Pgs. 7-8: P3P discloses an example of the

kind of information displayed by one P3P use agent, the AT&T Privacy Bird beta 1.1, where the

AT&T Privacy Bird displays specific icons at sites with P3P policies that match and that do not

match a user's privacy preferences. Users can click on the specific icon to view a summary of the

site's privacy policy that is generated automatically from the site's P3P policy. At sites that do not

match a user's preference, the policy summary also explains where the policy differs from the

user's preferences).

As per claim 4, the P3P/Silicon Press/Koike combination disclose claim 1 as rejected above,

where P3P further discloses the Web site privacy policy includes one or more policy statements

(Pgs. 4-5: a P3P policy is a collection of vocabulary and data elements that describes the data

practices of a particular web site (or section of a website)); and the comparing further comprises

comparing each privacy policy statement with each user concern (Pgs. 3, 7-8: tools to compare

each policy against the user's privacy preferences and assist the user in deciding when to

exchange data with websites).

As per claims 5 and 6, the P3P/Silicon Press/Koike combination disclose claim 1 as rejected

above, where P3P further discloses: wherein the privacy policy further comprises a policy file

that conforms to P3P (Platform for Privacy Preferences Project) standards (Pgs. 3-11: platform

for privacy preferences P3P); the privacy policy is contained in an XML (eXtensible Markup

Language) file (Pgs. 5-6, 9: policies in XML).

As per claim 8, the P3P/Silicon Press/Koike combination disclose claim 1 as rejected above, where Silicon Press further teaches notifying the user that a conflict exists between the user concerns and the Web site privacy policy file (Pgs. 2-3: process where web browsers match privacy policies against user preferences and alert the user in case of conflicts).

As per claim 9, the P3P/Silicon Press/Koike combination disclose claim 1 as rejected above, where P3P further discloses wherein the outputting is performed in response to a user request to display the Web site privacy policy (Pgs. 7-8: users can click on the specific icon to view a summary of the site's privacy policy that is generated automatically from the site's P3P policy).

As per claim 10, the P3P/Silicon Press/Koike combination disclose claim 1 as rejected above, where P3P further discloses where claim 1 further comprising receiving a user request to initiate a policy analysis (Pgs. 7-8: users can click on the specific icon to view a summary of the site's privacy policy that is generated automatically from the site's P3P policy).

As per claim 11, P3P discloses a web site privacy policy evaluation and transformation system, comprising: one or more processors; and memory having instructions executable by the one or more processors (Pg. 3: the Platform for Privacy Preferences (P3P) project addresses this problem by providing both a standard, computer-readable format for privacy policies and a protocol that enables web browsers to read and process privacy policies automatically; Pg. 8, 10: P3P user agent might be built into an electronic wallet or other software that includes data repository that stores data users usually exchange with web sites); a Web browser to allow the

user to access one or more network Web sites based on the evaluation of the privacy policy file

(Pg. 3-4: web browsers to communicate with web servers); a trust engine for evaluating the

privacy file (Pg. 7: user agent), the trust engine enabled to:

> notify the user when the network Web site does not contain the privacy policy file
>
> (Pgs. 4, 8: alert users at sites that do not match their preferences. Examiner notes
>
> that it can be broadly interpreted for user preferences to include a variety of user
>
> specific requirements such as an alert when a web site does not contain the
>
> privacy policy file); query the user as to whether the user wishes to continue
>
> browsing the network Web site when the network Web site does not contain the
>
> privacy policy file (Pgs. 3-4, 8: alert, prompt users to take appropriate actions);
>
> evaluate the privacy policy file when the network Web site does contain the
>
> privacy policy file by comparing the user concerns with the privacy policy file
>
> included in a Web site (Pgs. 3-4, 7-8: compare each policy against the user's
>
> privacy preferences; check for P3P privacy policies at web sites and display
>
> symbols to alert users at sites that do not match their preference).

> With respect to: "identify specific portions of the privacy policy file that conflict
>
> with the user concerns when the network Web site does contain the privacy policy
>
> file; store the identified specific portions of the privacy policy file to a conflict
>
> bucket located at a client computing device; a transformation module to transform
>
> the privacy policy file into a user centric policy display that emphasizes the
>
> specific portions of the privacy policy file that conflict with the user concerns;

and a user interface module to cause the display of the transformed privacy policy

file," P3P discloses an example of the kind of information displayed by one P3P

use agent, the AT&T Privacy Bird beta 1.1, where the AT&T Privacy Bird

displays specific icons at sites with P3P policies that match and that do not match

a user's privacy preferences. Users can click on the specific icon to view a

summary of the site's privacy policy that is generated automatically from the site's

P3P policy. At sites that do not match a user's preference, the policy summary

also explains where the policy differs from the user's preferences (Pgs. 7-8).

Additionally, the Silicon Press teaches pertinent subject matter indicating a

process where web browsers match privacy policies against user preferences and

alert the user in case of conflicts (Pgs. 2-3). Furthermore, Koike also teaches

pertinent subject matter directed to a method and system for administrating data

including privacy of a user in communication made between a server and a

terminal device. Koike teaches wherein a controller outputs data indicative of

inconsistency between the privacy preference and the privacy policy [0039].

Lastly, Koike teaches wherein if a privacy policy is judged to be unacceptable to a

user, a comparator outputs not only the results of comparison, but also data

indicative of inconsistency between the privacy policy and the privacy preference

([0121-122]; see also Claim 19 and its associated text). The Examiner in at least

the teachings of Koike interprets the process for storing, combining and

displaying the identified specific conflicting and non-conflicting portions

associated with website privacy policy and user concerns to be taught in the

teachings of Koike. Koike clearly teaches the key structural elements along with

the processes required for conduction a concrete presentation of a privacy policy

that has undergone specific data comparison analysis in order to verify a website's

privacy policy is in line with a user's privacy policy by displaying the results of

the data comparison via a display unit. Therefore, it would have been obvious to

one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the computer

readable format for privacy policies and protocol that enables web browsers to

read and process privacy policies automatically of P3P to include the process of

identifying conflicts between a website's privacy policy and user preferences as

taught by Silicon Press and to include the process of outputting conflicting and

non-conflicting web site privacy policy data comparison results as taught by

Koike in order to effectively present website viewers with a detailed result

outlining all of the data indicative to the data comparison process.

Examiner notes: A recitation directed to the manner in which a claimed apparatus is

intended to be used does not distinguish the claimed apparatus from the prior art- if the

prior art has the capability to so perform. See MPEP 2114 and *Ex parte Masham*, 2

USPQ2d 1647 (1987).

As per claim 12, the P3P/Silicon Press/Koike combination disclose claim 11 as rejected above,

where P3P further discloses wherein the trust engine further compares each user concern with

each of multiple statements making up the privacy policy file (Pgs. 3, 7-8: tools to compare each

policy against the user's privacy preferences and assist the user in deciding when to exchange

data with websites).

As per claim 13, the P3P/Silicon Press/Koike combination disclose claim 11 as rejected above,

where Silicon Press further teaches wherein the Web browser further provides a conflict

notification when there is a conflict between a user concern and the privacy policy file (Pgs. 2-3:

process where web browsers match privacy policies against user preferences and alert the user in

case of conflicts).

As per claim 15 the P3P/Silicon Press/Koike combination disclose claim 11 as rejected above,

where P3P further discloses wherein the user interface module displays the portions of the

privacy policy file that conflict with the user concerns more prominently than the portions of the

privacy policy file that do not conflict with the user concerns (Pgs. 7-8: P3P discloses an

example of the kind of information displayed by one P3P use agent, the AT&T Privacy Bird beta

1.1, where the AT&T Privacy Bird displays specific icons at sites with P3P policies that match

and that do not match a user's privacy preferences. Users can click on the specific icon to view a

summary of the site's privacy policy that is generated automatically from the site's P3P policy. At

sites that do not match a user's preference, the policy summary also explains where the policy

differs from the user's preferences).

As per claim 16, P3P discloses one or more computer-readable media including computer-

executable instructions that, when executed on a computer, perform a method of: receiving a set

of user concerns selected from a list of possible user concerns (Pg. 4: P3P tools allow users to

configure their web browsers with their personal privacy preference); comparing the set of user

concerns with a set of Web site privacy policy statements to determine if a privacy policy

statement conflicts with a user concern (Pgs. 3, 7-8: tools to compare each policy against the

user's privacy preferences and assist the user in deciding when to exchange data with websites).

With respect to: "identifying specific portions of the privacy policy statement that

conflict with the user concern; adding metadata to the privacy policy statements' internal

representation of the conflicting statements, the metadata to trigger additional details

within the privacy policy statements to be emphasized during a transforming of the

privacy policy statements; transforming the privacy policy statements to emphasize the

additional details within the privacy policy statements via the metadata; and causing the

display of the re-ordered privacy policy statements on a display device," P3P discloses an

example of the kind of information displayed by one P3P use agent, the AT&T Privacy

Bird beta 1.1, where the AT&T Privacy Bird displays specific icons at sites with P3P

policies that match and that do not match a user's privacy preferences. Users can click on

the specific icon to view a summary of the site's privacy policy that is generated

automatically from the site's P3P policy. At sites that do not match a user's preference,

the policy summary also explains where the policy differs from the user's preferences

(Pgs. 7-8). Additionally, the Silicon Press teaches pertinent subject matter indicating a

process where web browsers match privacy policies against user preferences and alert the

user in case of conflicts (Pgs. 2-3). Furthermore, Koike also teaches pertinent subject

matter directed to a method and system for administrating data including privacy of a

user in communication made between a server and a terminal device. Koike teaches

wherein a controller outputs data indicative of inconsistency between the privacy

preference and the privacy policy [0039]. Lastly, Koike teaches wherein if a privacy

policy is judged to be unacceptable to a user, a comparator outputs not only the results of

comparison, but also data indicative of inconsistency between the privacy policy and the

privacy preference ([0121-122]; see also Claim 19 and its associated text). The Examiner

in at least the teachings of Koike interprets the process for storing, combining and

displaying the identified specific conflicting and non-conflicting portions associated with

website privacy policy and user concerns to be taught in the teachings of Koike. Koike

clearly teaches the key structural elements along with the processes required for

conduction a concrete presentation of a privacy policy that has undergone specific data

comparison analysis in order to verify a website's privacy policy is in line with a user's

privacy policy by displaying the results of the data comparison via a display unit.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to modify the computer readable format for privacy policies and protocol that

enables web browsers to read and process privacy policies automatically of P3P to

include the process of identifying conflicts between a website's privacy policy and user

preferences as taught by Silicon Press and to include the process of outputting conflicting

and non-conflicting web site privacy policy data comparison results as taught by Koike in

order to effectively present website viewers with a detailed result outlining all of the data

indicative to the data comparison process.

As per claim 17, the P3P/Silicon Press/Koike combination disclose claim 16 as rejected above, where P3P further discloses collecting the set of user concerns from a user (Pgs. 3-4, 7-10: P3P tools allow users to configure their web browsers with their personal privacy preferences; collect information).

As per claim 18, the P3P/Silicon Press/Koike combination disclose claim 16 as rejected above, where P3P further discloses receiving a prompt from a user before executing the comparing, identifying, <u>transforming</u>, and the causing the display of (Pg. 3: prompt users).

As per claims 19 and 20, the P3P/Silicon Press/Koike combination disclose claim 16 as rejected above, where Silicon Press further teaches providing a conflict notification to a user to inform the user that specific portions of the privacy policy statement that conflict with the user concern have been identified; and only performing the causing the display of upon detection of a user response to the conflict notification (Pgs. 2-3: process where web browsers match privacy policies against user preferences and alert the user in case of conflicts; in case of a conflict the browser alerts the user who can then decide how to proceed).

Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over P3P in view of Silicon Press in view of Koike and in further view of W3Schools (www.w3schools.com) (© Feb. 2003).

As per claim 7, the P3P/Silicon Press/Koike combination disclose claim 1 as rejected above, but do not expressly disclose wherein outputting the Web site privacy policy includes outputting the

Web site privacy policy in an XSL (extensible Stylesheet Language) transformation. However,

W3Schools teaches how XML documents are displayed and transformed into XSL language

(Pgs.1-11, XSL transformation). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at

the time of the invention to modify the P3P/Silicon Press/Koike combination to include an XSL

transformation process for displaying the re-ordered web site privacy policy as taught by

W3Schools in order to efficiently and effectively display the privacy policy in XSL format.

Please note:

Examiner has pointed out particular references contained in the prior arts of record in the body

of this action for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are

representative of the teachings in the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the

individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested

from the applicant, in preparing the response, to consider fully the entire references as

potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as

taught by the prior arts or disclosed by the examiner.

Applicant(s) are reminded that optional or conditional elements do not narrow the claims

because they can always be omitted. See *e.g.* MPEP §2106 II C: "Language that suggest or

makes optional but does not require steps to be performed or does not limit a claim to a particular

structure does not limit the scope of a claim or claim limitation"; and *In re Johnston*, 435 F.3d

1381, 77 USPQ2d 1788, 1790 (Fed. Cir. 2006) "As a matter of linguistic precision, optional

elements do not narrow the claim because they can always be omitted." *In re Johnston*, 435 F.3d

1381, 77 USPQ2d 1788, 1790 (Fed. Cir. 2006)(where the Federal Circuit affirmed the Board's

claim construction of "further including that said wall may be smooth, corrugated, or profiled

with increased dimensional proportions as pipe size is increased" since "this additional content

did not narrow the scope of the claim because these limitations are stated in the permissive form

'may.'").

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 2/5/2010 have been fully considered but they are not

persuasive. In the remarks applicant argues the following:

(1) Applicant submits that amendments to claim 1 render the pending § 103 rejections

moot. Applicant submits that the combination of P3P, Silicon Press, and Koike does not

teach or suggest at least the following features of this claim, as amended. Applicant first

submits that the combination of P3P1 Silicon Press, and Koike does not teach or suggest

"storing the identified specific portions of the Web site privacy policy to a conflict bucket

of the client computer, the conflict bucket limited to the specific portions of the Web site

privacy policy that conflict with the user concerns" as recited in Applicant's claim 1.

Applicant submits that Koike fails to teach or suggest the elements of claim 1 since

Koike stores the "data indicative of inconsistency between the privacy preference and the

privacy policy" to a third memory of "a privacy data administrator connected between a

server and a terminal of device." (Paragraphs [0036] and [0039] and figure I, emphasis

added). In other words, Koike stores the data indicative of inconsistency between the

privacy preference and the privacy policy" to a memory location outside of the client

device (paragraph [0039] and figure 1) rather than to "a conflict bucket of the client

computer" as recited in Applicant's claim 1. Applicant further submits that the third

memory of Koike stores more than just conflict data. Specifically, Koike discusses

storing "data indicative of results of comparison of the privacy preference and the privacy

policy to each other, and the reply having been made in response to the inquiry, and a

privacy data filter of a user for administrating data including privacy" (paragraph [0047],

emphasis added) rather than "the conflict bucket limited to the specific portions of the

Web site privacy policy that conflict with the user concerns" as recited in Applicant's

claim 1. (Emphasis added). P3P and Silicon Press fail to remedy the deficiencies in Koike

noted above with respect to claim 1. Applicant further submits that the combination of

P3P, Silicon Press, and Koike does not teach or suggest "combining the identified

specific portions from the conflict bucket with non-conflicting portions of the Web site

privacy policy to a user interface, the user interface including a single instance of each

element of the Web site privacy policy" as recited in Applicant's claim 1 (Emphasis

added). Accordingly, Applicant submits that Koike states outputting conflicting data

rather than "combining the identified specific portions from the conflict bucket with non-

conflicting portions of the Web site privacy policy to a user interface, the user interface

including a single instance of each element of the Web site privacy policy" as recited in

Applicant's claim 1. Consequently, P3P, Silicon Press, in view of Koike does not teach or

suggest all of the elements and features of claim 1. Claim 7 depends from independent

claim 1, given the evidence and arguments as well as clarifying amendments for claim 1,

Applicant respectfully submits that P3P, Silicon Press, Koike, and W3Schools1 in

combination, fail to render the claimed subject matter obvious.

(2) Applicant submits that amendments to claim 11 render the pending 103 rejections

moot. Applicant submits that the combination of P3P, Silicon Press, and Koike does not

teach or suggest at least the following features of this claim, as amended (with emphasis

added): store the identified specific portions of the privacy policy file to a conflict bucket

located at a client computing device. Claims 12-13 and 15 ultimately depend from

independent claim 11. As discussed above, claim 11 is believed allowable over the cited

art. Therefore, claims 12-13 and 15 are also allowable over the combination of P3P,

Silicon Press, and Koike at least for their dependency from an allowable base claim.

Claims 12-13 and 15 may also be allowable for the additional features recited.

(3) Applicant submits that amendments to claim 16 render the pending 103 rejections

moot. Applicant submits that the combination of P3P Silicon Press, and Koike does not

teach or suggest at least the following features of this claim, as amended (with emphasis

added): adding metadata to the privacy policy statements, internal representation of the

conflicting statements, the metadata to trigger additional details within the privacy policy

statements to be emphasized during a transforming of the privacy policy statements.

Applicant submits that the generation of the summary including explaining the

differences fails to teach or suggest the elements of Applicant's claim 16 since P3P is

silent as to "adding metadata" as recited in Applicant's claim 16. Rather, P3P simply

generates the summary "from the site's P3P policy." (Id.). Consequently, P3P, Silicon

Press, in view of Koike does not teach or suggest all of the elements and features of claim

16. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 16 be withdrawn. Claims 17-20 ultimately depend from independent claim 16. As discussed above, claim 16 is believed allowable over the cited art.

In response to arguments (1)-(3), the Examiner respectfully disagrees. Amendments to claims 1-3, 11, 16 and 18 do not overcome the present prior art rejection. The process of "storing", "combining" and "displaying" non-conflicting and conflicting privacy policy information is expressly disclosed by the P3P/Silicon Press/Koike combination. Also, the amended claim language lacks sufficient support from the specification, as noted above. For reasons of clarification the Examiner has cited other passages from the cited prior art in order to point out the obviousness connection encompassing the newly amended claimed elements. Also note, limitations, such as data gathering, field of use limitations, storing, collecting, sending, receiving, and other forms of insignificant extra solution activity are not enough to convert an abstract idea into a statutory process. Please see claim rejection above.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing

date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to BOB CHUMPITAZ whose telephone number is (571) 270-5494.

The examiner can normally be reached on M-TR: 7:30AM - 6:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, JOHN WEISS can be reached on (571) 272-6812. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-270-6494.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would

like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated

information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

B. C.

Examiner, Art Unit 3629

/JOHN G. WEISS/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3629